UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,943	12/11/2003	William Kress Bodin	AUS920030839US1	8719

34533 7590 01/30/2006

INTERNATIONAL CORP (BLF)
c/o BIGGERS & OHANIAN, LLP
P.O. BOX 1469
AUSTIN, TX 78767-1469

EXAMINER	
FABER, DAVID	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/733,943	BODIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Faber	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 December 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *11 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/11/03, 5/9/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application filed 11 December 2003.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1, 11, and 21 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11 December 2003 and 9 May 2005. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 11 December 2003 are accepted.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 9, 10 and 22 are objected to because of the following informalities:

a) Claim 9 depends on Claim 7. Because of recitation of "classifying a structural element" in the line 1, it is believed Claim 9 was intended to depend on Claim 8 and has been treated as such for the remainder of this Office action.

b) Claim 10 depends on Claim 7. Because of recitation of "creating a presentation grammar for the structural document" in the line 1, it is believed Claim 9 was intended to depend on Claim 8 and has been treated as such for the remainder of this Office action.

c) Claim 22, depends on Claim 11, was believed intended to depend on Claim 21, and has been treated as such for the remainder of this Office action.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3, 11-13, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosea et al (US PGPub 2002/0138331, published 9/26/2002).

As per independent Claim 1, Hosea et al discloses a method comprising:

- providing user profiles representing users capable of participating in presentations, each user profile including user classifications for a user; (e.g. Paragraph 0041, lines 5-14; Paragraph 0048: Discloses the use of a user profile that contains user preferences that include demographic and psychographic data. Paragraph 0042 describes how user preferences are generated. Hosea et al's invention of personalization of a web page is available to all requesting users. (Paragraph 0034, lines 1-8))
- providing a presentation document including a structured document having structural elements classified with classification identifiers; (An HTML file of

the requested Web page is considered a presentation document, which is formed of constituent components that include content component and formatting components. (Paragraph 0043; lines 5-9) In addition, Hosea et al discloses of a HTML profile that includes classifications for the content components of the HTML file. (Paragraph 0043, lines 1-5; 11-14) Paragraph 0045, lines 14-16, discloses that the ability of the HTML file is combined with the HTML profile of being merged as one file, as in one document)

- identifying a user profile event for a user during the presentation; (Paragraph 0039; 0041 discloses the method of identifying a user ID in the event of accessing a URL. Once ID is determined, the user profile corresponding to the user ID is obtained and used to filter out content to produce a modified Web page. (Paragraph 13, lines 9-14)

Hosea et al fails to specifically disclose that adding to the session structured document at least one structural element from the presentation document, the added structural element having a classification identifier that corresponds to a user classification of the user. However, Hosea et al discloses in Paragraph 0047, lines 1-3, using the classification of each content component from the HTML profile/file to analyze its relevance to the requesting user wherein Paragraph 0046 discloses the process of comparing the components to the interest of the user and is either eliminated, rearranged, or new content may be added. Thus, a new modified Web page is created with the included components by the user preferences. (Paragraph 0047) It was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that each content

component contained structural elements disclosing the location of the content component within the structure a HTML file. Hosea et al discloses these structural elements as formatting components within a HTML file in Paragraph 0043. Thus, when a content component is added or reorganized within Hosea et al's personalization web page method, structural elements would have been added or edited to disclose the new location of the content component within the modified version of the requesting user web page.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al's method with the disclosure above since it provided a method for personalizing displays of published Web pages provided by Web content providers to meet the interests of Web users accessing the pages, based on profiles of the users.

As per dependent Claim 2, Hosea et al fails to specifically disclose the user profile event comprises adding a user to the presentation, wherein the added user has a new user classification for the presentation. However, Hosea et al discloses an embodiment of the well-known Web portal, "My Yahoo" by Yahoo. (Paragraph 0008, FIG. 1-6) It was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention that Yahoo/My Yahoo system allowed a user to create an account within their system, which produced a user profile for that account. Once the profile is created/added, the user has the ability to personalize content reflecting their interests that results in a new personalized Web page when finished customizing. Thus, new

user accounts produce new user classifications or preferences relating to the presentation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al's method with the disclosure above since it provided a method for personalizing displays of published Web pages provided by Web content providers to meet the interests of Web users accessing the pages, based on profiles of the users.

As per dependent Claim 3, Hosea et al discloses a method:

- changing a user classification in a user profile of a user who is participating in the presentation, wherein the changed user classification includes a new user classification for the presentation. (Paragraph 0051; lines 12-17 discloses a user interests change based on their Web surfing activity, thus resulting in their profile automatically changing to their new interests. Paragraph 0013, lines 3-9; Paragraph 0042 discloses the real-time generating of user profile interests/preferences/classifications. Hosea et al also discloses another embodiment of manually changing user interests on viewing specific types of content. (Paragraph 0008)

As per independent Claim 11, Claim 11 recites a system for performing the method of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 11 is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 12, Claim 12 recites similar limitations as in Claim 2 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al.

As per dependent Claim 13, Claim 13 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al.

As per independent Claim 21, Claim 21 recites a computer program product for performing the method of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 21 is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al. Furthermore, Hosea et al discloses a recording medium (Page 7, Claim 45: memory for storing programs)

As per dependent Claim 22, Claim 22 recites similar limitations as in Claim 2 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al.

As per dependent Claim 23, Claim 23 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al.

8. Claims 4-7, 14-17, and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosea et al (US PGPub 2002/0138331, published 9/26/2002) in further view of Ladd et al (US Patent #6,269,336, patented 7/31/2001).

As per dependent Claim 4, Hosea et al fails to specifically disclose adding a grammar element to the session grammar in dependence upon the added structural element. However, Hosea et al discloses that additional content may be added to the personalized Web page during modification. On the other hand, Ladd et al discloses the creation of a markup language document used by a voice browser that contains a plurality of elements (Abstract, lines 13-14) that describe the structure of a document or page, provide pronunciation of words and phrases, and place markers in the text to control interactive voice services. The markup language also provides elements that

control phrasing, emphasis, pitch, speaking rate, and other characteristics. (Column 16, lines 11-17) The markup language also contains text, navigational controls, and input controls for voice applications. (Column 15, lines 60-64) Column 16, line 21- Column 38, line 25, discloses all the elements used by Ladd et al. Since Ladd et al discloses the markup language (ML) document is created containing grammar elements, it was well-known to one of ordinary skill that creating a ML document involves the process of adding, or deleting elements and text within the document, which the same process is followed when editing, updating or amending a document. Thus, one of ordinary skill would have been able to add new elements of Ladd et al's grammar elements after a document was created by Hosea et al's method.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al's method with Ladd et al's method since Ladd et al's method would have provided users to access information from an information source using voice inputs or commands.

As per dependent Claim 5, Hosea et al discloses a method:

- identifying a presentation document for a presentation, the presentation document including a structured document having structural elements classified with classification identifiers; (An HTML file of the requested Web page is considered a presentation document, which is formed of constituent components that include content components and formatting components. (Paragraph 0043; lines 5-9) In addition, Hosea et al discloses of a HTML profile that includes classifications for the content components of the HTML

file. (Paragraph 0043, lines 1-5; 11-14) Paragraph 0045, lines 14-16, discloses that the ability of the HTML file is combined with the HTML profile of being merged as one file, as in one document)

- identifying a user participant for the presentation, the user having a user profile comprising user classifications; and (e.g. Paragraph 0041, lines 5-14; Paragraph 0048: Discloses the use of a user profile that contains user preferences that include demographic and psychographic data. Paragraph 0042 describes how user preferences are generated)
- filtering the structured document in dependence upon the user classifications and the classification identifiers to create a session document. (Paragraphs 0046-0047 discloses the use of the HTML file/profile and user profile by comparing the classifications of each content component with the user preferences to create a modified personalized web page.)

However, Hosea et al fails to disclose that the presentation document includes presentation grammar. On the other hand, Ladd et al discloses the use of voice grammar on a markup language document by using a voice browser. Ladd et al discloses the markup language contains text, navigational controls, and input controls for voice applications. (Column 15, lines 60-64) In addition, the markup language can include elements that place markers in the text to control interactive voice services. (Column 16, lines 11-14). With the use of the voice browser application, it fetches the markup language document for user interaction. (Column 13, line 66 – Column 14, line 9) The voice browser collects user input and determines the grammar for user's speech

recognition. It determines if a pre-determined grammar exists for the input and markup language. Once the grammar been found, it's sent to the VRU server recognize the user input by comparing the grammar to the user input. (Column 14, lines 10-42; FIG 5) In addition, Ladd et al discloses the use of a detection unit that compares audio inputs to the grammar stored in database. The detector monitors the inputs for key phrases or word, which is then sent to VRU for responses to the said key phrase. (Column 10, lines 12-20)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al's method with Ladd et al's method since Ladd et al's method would have provided users to access information from an information source using voice inputs or commands.

As per dependent Claim 6, Claim 6 recites similar limitation as in Claim 1 and is rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Hosea et al discloses a method:

- extracting, from the structured document, structural elements having classification identifiers corresponding to the user classifications; and writing the extracted structural elements into a session structured document in the session document. (Paragraph 0043, lines 14-15 discloses that the HTML file is parsed to extract the constituent components, which include content components with formatting components (Paragraph 0043, lines 5-7), and analyzing and rating the content components. Then, Paragraph 0047, lines 1-3, discloses uses the classification of each content component from the HTML profile/file to analyze its relevance to the requesting user wherein

Paragraph 0046 discloses the process of comparing the components to the interest of the user and is either eliminated, rearranged, or new content may be added. Thus, a new modified Web page is created with the included components by the user preferences (Paragraph 0047))

As per dependent Claim 7, Hosea et al fails to specifically disclose that filtering the presentation grammar, in dependence upon the extracted structural elements, into a session grammar in the session document. However, Hosea et al discloses that the voice browser determines if pre-determined grammar or pre-existing grammar is contained in the markup language. (Column 14, lines 18-20) In addition, Ladd et al discloses the markup language contains text, navigational controls, and input controls for voice applications (Column 15, lines 60-64) and the markup language can include elements that place markers in the text to control interactive voice services. (Column 16, lines 11-14). Ladd et al's method of structural elements that contain voice commands, navigational controls, or voice place markers in a markup language can be incorporated into the structural components of Hosea et al's method allowing the creation of the modified HTML file in Hosea et al's that only contains voice elements to its relevant components, which links to the corresponding selected grammar, thus filtering out the grammar of the presentation document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al's method with Ladd et al's method since Ladd et al's method would have provided users to access information from an

As per dependent Claim 14, Claim 14 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 15, Claim 15 recites similar limitations as in Claim 5 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 16, Claim 16 recites similar limitations as in Claim 6 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 17, Claim 17 recites similar limitations as in Claim 7 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 24, Claim 24 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 25, Claim 25 recites similar limitations as in Claim 5 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 26, Claim 26 recites similar limitations as in Claim 6 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

As per dependent Claim 27, Claim 27 recites similar limitations as in Claim 7 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al and Ladd et al.

9. Claims 8-10, 18-20, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosea et al (US PGPub 2002/0138331, published 9/26/2002) in further view of Ladd et al (US Patent #6,269,336, patented 7/31/2001) in further view of Huang (US PGPub 2001/0032218, published 10/18/2001)

As per dependent claim 8, Hosea et al fails to specifically disclose creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document includes grammar elements each of which includes an identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document. However, Ladd et al discloses the use of creating a markup language that document having a plurality of elements, that include markup tags, wherein elements describe the structure of the document, provide pronunciation of words and phrases, and place markers in the text to control interactive voice services, such as controlling phrasing, emphasis, pitch, and speaking rate. (Column 16, lines 5-20) The markup language also includes input controls for voice applications (Column 15, lines 60-64). Using a voice browser application to interrupt the markup language document, a grammar is dynamically created if a pre-existing grammar is not found in a stored database, and once generated it is sent to the VRU server. (Column 14, lines 18-42)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al's method with Ladd et al's method since Ladd et al's method would have provided users to access information from an information source using voice inputs or commands.

Furthermore, Hosea et al and Ladd et al fail to specifically disclose creating, in dependence upon an original document, a structured document comprising one or more structural elements; classifying a structural element of the structured document according to a presentation attribute. However, Huang discloses a method for converting unstructured documents into structured documents. (Abstract, lines 1-3) In

addition, Huang discloses an identifier is assigned to each document element that may include a name, font, type name, or a color where the identifier is in data of each of the document elements. (Paragraph 0050, lines 5-7) In addition, FIG. 7 discloses the arranging of character data within classification element tags, such as ingredient, wherein each of the data elements for the character data contains element presentation attributes for font types and font colors. (FIG. 7, 706)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al and Ladd et al's method with Huang's method since Huang's method would have provided users to convert unstructured documents for various presentations.

As per dependent Claim 9, Hosea et al and Ladd et al fail to specifically disclose identifying a presentation attribute for the structural element; identifying a classification identifier in dependence upon the presentation attribute; and inserting the classification identifier in association with the structural element in the structured document. However, Huang discloses using an association table (FIG. 5; Paragraph 0067, Page 6, lines 3-6) for the document elements defined in a desired DTD and associated font attributes which parses the input document into data elements and its assigned font attributes. (Paragraph 0067) FIG. 6 discloses an editing result for the unstructured document in which each parsed data elements are assigned with font attributes that also involves region grouping of data elements. Hence, ingredient elements are grouped together, and so are procedure elements. In correlation with the association table, the grouped elements are identified under one element, such as ingredient, and are inserted during

the converting of the structured document. FIG 7 discloses the insertion of element tags with each of its assigned attributes, which were assigned when the document was parsed, in which the use of mapping rules converted documents into a structured document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al and Ladd et al's method with Huang's method since Huang's method would have provided users to convert unstructured documents for various presentations.

As per dependent Claim 10, Hosea et al fails to specifically disclose selecting, in dependence upon the content type, a full presentation grammar from among a multiplicity of full presentation grammars; and filtering the full presentation grammar into a presentation grammar for the structured document in dependence upon the structural elements of the structured document. On the other hand, Ladd et al discloses selecting a grammar from a pre-determined/existing grammar stored in a database or in the markup language based on the user inputs. (Column 14, lines 18-42) In addition, Ladd et al discloses the markup language contains text, navigational controls, and input controls for voice applications (Column 15, lines 60-64) and the markup language can include elements that place markers in the text to control interactive voice services. (Column 16, lines 11-14). Ladd et al's method of structural elements that contain voice commands, navigational controls, or voice place markers in a markup language can be incorporated into the structural components of Hosea et al's method allowing the creation of the modified HTML file in Hosea et al's that only contains voice elements to

its relevant components, which links to the corresponding selected grammar, thus filtering out the grammar of the presentation document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al's method with Ladd et al's method since Ladd et al's method would have provided users to access information from an information source using voice inputs or commands.

Furthermore, Hosea et al and Ladd et al fail to specifically disclose identifying the content type of the original document. However, Huang discloses stating the unstructured document (Paragraph 0035, lines 8-12) is printed to a metafile format, mostly commonly Portable Data Format, so the metafile format can be opened or read identically in many different environments. (Paragraph 0043) It was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art that when converting the unstructured document into a metafile for conversion purposes, the program doing the conversion is able to read and understand the data format, able to identify the content type of the unstructured document and able to transfer the content into a metafile format.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have combined Hosea et al and Ladd et al's method with Huang's method since Huang's method would have provided users to convert unstructured documents for various presentations.

As per dependent Claim 18, Claim 18 recites similar limitations as in Claim 8 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 19, Claim 19 recites similar limitations as in Claim 9 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 20, Claim 20 recites similar limitations as in Claim 10 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 28, Claim 28 recites similar limitations as in Claim 8 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 29, Claim 29 recites similar limitations as in Claim 9 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Huang.

As per dependent Claim 30, Claim 30 recites similar limitations as in Claim 10 and is similarly rejected under Hosea et al, Ladd et al and Huang.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Chao (US PGPub 20040205081): Discloses classifying elements of a document.
- Ikeda et al (US Patent #6,505,195): Discloses the classification of retrievable documents according to types of attribute elements.
- Isaac et al (US Patent #6,647,531): Discloses the constructing a customized document from an original document.
- Nazem et al (US Patent #5,983,227): Discloses the constructing a customized document from an original document.

- Kelsey (US PGPub 20010054048): Discloses forming a structural document.
- Hosea et al (PCT WO 01/20481 A2): Discloses web user profiling.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-272-2751. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8am to 430p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Faber
Patent Examiner
AU 2178

DF

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER